



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,715	11/17/2003	Mark M. Josephsen	100201919-1	4953
22879 7590 04/01/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
			EXAMINER ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
			ART UNIT 3628	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,715

Applicant(s)

JOSEPHSEN ET AL.

Examiner

AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-17, 24, 26-29 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-17, 24, 26-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 1/14/08, the following is a final office action. Claims 1 and 31 have been amended, claims 2, 3, 18-23, 25 and 30 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-17, 24, 26-29 and 31 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been slightly adjusted to further clarify the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fernberg ("What are the Real Costs of Copying").

As per claim 1, Fernberg discloses:

recording a type of media actually used, (paragraph 4, line 2, [note the types of originals used]);

determining an amount of pigment used on the single sheet of media, (paragraph 6, line 4, toner include in determining cost *per* copy, where the total amount of copies per month can always just be one copy), and

determining an amortized cost related to the printing device per sheet of media and/or related to an operation of the printing device, (paragraph 7, lines 4-7, amortized over three years); and

calculating the cost of printing to the media by adding a cost of the single sheet of media actually used and a cost of the pigment used on the single sheet of media, and an amortized cost related to the printing device per sheet of media and/or related to an operation of the printing device/further comprising adding a cost of amortization of the printing device to the cost of the media and the cost of the pigment, (paragraph 7, lines 7-17, add cost of ...toners...paper, to amortized costs to ultimately determine total cost *per copy*, where the total amount of copies per month can always just be one copy).

As per claim 31, Fernberg discloses:

providing a per page cost of a first media, a per page cost of a second media, a cost of pigment, and a per page amortized cost of a printing device, (Paragraph 7); and

requesting fulfillment of a print job and, after fulfilling at least a portion of the print job, (Paragraph 3), the printing device determining the cost associated with each page based on the pigment used and the use of either the first media or the second media and per page amortized cost for using the printing device, (paragraph 7, lines 4-7, amortized over three years, and paragraph 7, lines 7-17, add cost of ...toners...paper, to amortized costs to ultimately determine total cost per copy

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernberg ("What are the Real Costs of Copying").

As per claim 24, Fernberg discloses:

determine a number of dots in a first pane of a page of a print job, (Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, dpi or dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs);

record a type of media actually used, (paragraph 4, line 2, [note the types of originals used]);

calculate a cost of the pigment used and a cost of the media used, (paragraph 6, line 4, toner include in determining cost per copy, and paragraph 5, line 1, calculate cost per copy);

amortize the cost of the printing device on a per operation basis, (paragraph 7, lines 4-7, amortized over three years);

and add the amortized cost to the cost of the pigment and the cost of the media, (paragraph 7, lines 7-17, add cost of ...toners...paper, to amortized costs to ultimately determine total cost per copy).

Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following:

multiply the number of dots in the first pane by an average pigment cost per dot to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page;

However does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, which suggests that the number of dots is incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy, thereby making it obvious to multiply the number of dots in each pane by an average pigment cost to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to multiply the number of dots in the first pane by an average pigment cost per dot to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

6. Claims 4-13, 15-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernberg ("What are the Real Costs of Copying"), and further in view of Lacheze et al (US 5,956,698).

As per claim 4, Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following, however does disclose calculating the cost of copying in paragraph 7.

However, Lacheze et al discloses:

Further comprising allocating the cost of printing to the media to an entity, (Col. 4, lines 14-26, shows a system for printing or copying where billing information for prints/copies is transmitted to location selected by customer). Lacheze et al discloses

Art Unit: 3628

this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that users are capable of electronically receiving accounting information in a print/copy system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to allocate the cost of printing of the media to an entity with the motivation of allowing the user to physically access billing information.

As per claim 5, Fernberg discloses:

identifying an entity to which the costs will be allocated, (paragraph 3, [indicate user's name]);

recording a type of media actually used for the entity, (paragraph 4, line 2, [note the types of originals used]);

recording a number of sheets of the type of media actually used for the entity, (paragraph 3, line 3, number of originals and number of copies);

determining an amount of pigment used on each of the sheets of media, (paragraph 6, line 4, toner include in determining cost per copy);

calculating a cost of the media actually used and a cost of the pigment used on all the sheets of media used for the entity, (paragraphs 5-7); and

Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following, however does disclose calculating the cost of copying in paragraph 7.

However, Lacheze et al discloses:

allocating the cost of the media actually used and the cost of the pigment used to the entity, (Col. 4, lines 14-26, shows a system for printing or copying where billing information for prints/copies is transmitted to location selected by customer). Lacheze

et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that users are capable of electronically receiving accounting information in a print/copy system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to allocate the cost of printing of the media to an entity with the motivation of allowing the user to physically access billing information.

As per claims 6, 7, Fernberg discloses:

further comprising storing the entity identification, the type of media, the number of sheets of media of a particular type and the amount of pigment used/further comprising storing the entity identification, the type of media, the number of sheets of media of a particular type and the amount of pigment used for each of the number of sheets of media in a print job, (paragraph 3, lines 1-4, user name, number of originals, number of copies, w/ paragraph 6, line 4, toner).

As per claim 8, Fernberg discloses:

determining the number of dots needed to form an image on a sheet, (Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, dpi or dots per inch for determining cost per copy for a color image);

Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following:

multiplying the number of dots on the sheet by an average pigment cost per dot,

However does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, which suggests that the number of dots is incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy, thereby making it obvious to multiply the number of dots in each pane by an

Art Unit: 3628

average pigment cost to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to multiply the number of dots in the first pane by an average pigment cost per dot to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

As per claim 9, 10, 12, 13, Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following:

Wherein the average pigment cost to differ in response to a density of each dot on the sheet/wherein the cost of pigment varies as a function of the density of dots on a page varies.

But Fernberg does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, which suggests that the number of dots is incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy.

However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the copy art for the average pigment cost to differ in response to a density of each dot on the sheet or for the average pigment cost of the first pigment to increase as the density of the dots increases.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the average pigment cost to differ in response to a density of

each dot on the sheet or for the average pigment cost of the first pigment to increase as the density of the dots increases since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

As per claim 11, Fernberg discloses:

determining the number of dots of a color used to form a color pane, the color panes overlayed with one another to form an image, (Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, dpi or dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs);

Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following:

multiplying the number of dots in the color pane by an average pigment cost per dot to allocate the cost of a pigment for a color associated with the image.

However does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, which suggests that the number of dots is incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy, thereby making it obvious to multiply the number of dots in each pane by an average pigment cost to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to multiply the number of dots in the color pane by an average pigment cost per dot to allocate the cost of a pigment for a color associated with the

image since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

As per claims 15, Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following, but does disclose cost reporting applied to type of print media/pigment as shown in paragraphs 5-7.

However, Lacheze et al discloses:

wherein identifying an entity to which the costs will be allocated further comprises entering a billing code associated with the entity, (col. 1, lines 52-58, shows example where billing meters are hard coded for selection by user). Lacheze et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a user can enter in parameters that will identify billing for a particular print job.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to enter in a billing code associated with the entity with the motivation of providing a way to bill a particular user for a print job.

As per claim 16, Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following, but does disclose cost reporting applied to type of print media/pigment as shown in paragraphs 5-7.

However, Lacheze et al discloses:

wherein identifying an entity to which the costs will be allocated further comprises entering a billing code associated with the entity and a code associated with a print

job, (Col. 10, lines 61-66, job identifier). Lacheze et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a user can enter in parameters that will identify billing for a particular print job.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to enter in a billing code associated with the entity and a code associated with a print job with the motivation of providing a way to bill a particular user for a print job.

As per claim 17, Fernberg discloses:

Further comprising adding a cost of amortization of the printing device to the cost of the media and the cost of the pigment, (paragraph 7).

7. Claims 26-29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernberg ("What are the Real Costs of Copying"), and further in view of McLean (US 2002/0099456 A1).

As per claims 26, Fernberg discloses:

a data storage system for storing information regarding a cost per sheet of media associated with the printing device, and a cost of pigment associated with the printing device, (paragraph 1, [auditron/copy counter inside machine], paragraph 7); and

record an actual number of sheets of media used to execute a print job and to record an amount of pigment used on each sheet of media for execution of the print job, the data processing system multiplying the actual number of sheets of media used by the cost per sheet of media and adding the cost of pigment for each of the pages to determine a cost associated with the print job, the data processing system further

operative to allocate the cost of the print job to an entity, (paragraph 3, number of originals/copies, paragraph 6, line4, toner include in determining cost per copy).

Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following, however does disclose a copier, where a log is taken for copies made over a three or four month period in paragraph 2, thereby suggesting that print jobs are sent to the copier if actual copies are being made, and making the following obvious:

a data processing system coupled to said data storage system and operative to receive a print job.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for a data processing system to be coupled to the data storage with the motivation having the means to process the print job and make a print or copy.

Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following, but does disclose cost reporting applied to type of print media/pigment as shown in paragraphs 5-7.

However, Lacheze et al discloses:

wherein allocating the cost of the print job to an entity includes storing a billing code in the data storage system associated with the entity, the data processing system reading a billing code associated with the print job and allocating the cost of the print job to the entity associated with the billing code, (Col. 10, lines 61-66, job identifier).

Lacheze et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a user can enter in parameters that will identify billing for a particular print job.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention where allocating the cost of the print job to an entity includes storing a billing code in the data storage system associated with the entity, the data processing system reading a billing code associated with the print job and allocating the cost of the print job to the entity associated with the billing code with the motivation of providing a way to bill a particular user for a print job.

As per claims 27, Fernberg discloses:

wherein said data storage system stores the cost of the pigment as a cost per dot of pigment, and wherein the data processing system records a number of dots per page and multiplies the number of dots on a particular page by the cost per dot to determine the cost of pigment per page, (Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, dpi or dots per inch for determining cost per copy for a color image).

As per claim 28, Fernberg does not specifically disclose the following:

Wherein the average pigment cost to differ in response to a density of each dot on the sheet/wherein the cost of pigment varies as a function of the density of dots on a page varies.

But Fernberg does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, which suggests that the number of dots is

incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy.

However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the copy art for the average pigment cost to differ in response to a density of each dot on the sheet or for the average pigment cost of the first pigment to increase as the density of the dots increases.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the average pigment cost to differ in response to a density of each dot on the sheet or for the average pigment cost of the first pigment to increase as the density of the dots increases since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

As per claims 29, Fernberg discloses:

wherein the data storage system also stores an amortized cost for wear on the printing device based on the number of sheets of media anticipated to be printed over the life of the printing device, the amortized cost on a per sheet of media basis, the data processing system adding the amortized cost per sheet of media to the cost of the sheets of media and the cost of the pigment, (paragraph 7, lines 4-7, amortized over three years, where average life-cycle of a copier is about three years, so amortizing over this period of time represents wear on the printing device, and paragraph 7, lines

Art Unit: 3628

7-17, add cost of ...toners...paper, to amortized costs to ultimately determine total cost per copy).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernberg ("What are the Real Costs of Copying"), and further in view of Lacheze et al (US 5,956,698), and further in view of McLean (US 2002/0099456 A1).

As per claims 14, Fernberg discloses:

determining a number of dots, (Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, dpi or dots per inch for determining cost per copy for a color image);

Neither Fernberg nor Lacheze et al specifically disclose the following, but Fernberg does disclose determining cost per copy in paragraph 5.

However, McLean discloses:

separating the print job into a first color pane and a second color pane/
determining...in a first color pane, determining...in a second color pane, ([0048], shows display screen consist of 3 panes, w/ [0064], shows definition of pane colors, therefore if there are 3 panes, there are therefore at least 3 different pane colors). McLean discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that multiple color panes are used to control a printer or copier setting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to separate the print job into first and second color panes with the motivation of allowing prints to be printed out with different colors.

Neither Fernberg nor Lacheze et al specifically disclose the following:

multiplying the number of dots in the first color pane by an average pigment cost per dot to allocate/multiplying the number of dots in the second color pane by an average pigment cost per dot of a second color to allocate the cost of a pigment for the second color associated with a page.

However, Fernberg does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, which suggests that the number of dots is incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy.

However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the copy art to multiplying the number of dots in each pane to allocate costs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to multiply the number of dots in each pane to allocate costs since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 1/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 1, applicant argues that Fernberg does not teach any kind of print cost accounting that includes determining the amount of pigment actually used on a single printed sheet, but only teaches that the cost per copy for a copy machine used over the course of a month may be computed by adding the "operating cost" and the

"cost of all expendable supplies" and then "divide the sum by the number of copies per month. Applicants also acknowledge that Fernberg's "expendable supplies" include "toners", but Fernberg says nothing about determining the amount of toner used on a single sheet, and that there is no indication at all in Fernberg that she does anything other than determine the cost of toner on a monthly basis without regard to the amount of toner used on any individual sheet. However, Fernberg determines cost per copy. Although it is true that Fernberg computes the cost per copy for a copy machine used over the course of a month, in this case, the total amount of copies per month can always be one copy.

As per claim 31, applicant argues that Fernberg does not teach determining the cost associated with each page in a print job based on the actual pigment used, and at most teaches only that a per copy cost may be computed based on total monthly cost of toner and other "expendable supplies." , and does not teach or suggest that her copy machine somehow determines the actual toner used on each page in a print job. However, the same argument applies as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Since Fernberg discloses a per copy cost based on total monthly cost of toner and other "expendable supplies.", if only one copy is made during the month period, the cost associated with one page, and therefore each page in a print job based on the actual pigment used is therefore determined, where the toner used represents the pigment used.

As per claim 24, applicant argues that Fernberg's acknowledgement that print resolution as measured in dpi may reflect copy quality suggests nothing at all about

Art Unit: 3628

color panes and pigment costs per dot generally, and specifically not multiplying the number of dots in the first pane by an average pigment cost per dot to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page. However since Fernberg does disclose counting dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs in Paragraph 16, lines 3-7, this suggests that the number of dots is incorporated into, and effects the determination of the cost of color pigmentation on a copy, thereby making it obvious to multiply the number of dots in each pane by an average pigment cost to determine the cost of a pigment associated with the first pane of a page. Specifically speaking, an ordinarily skilled artisan would find it obvious to count dots per inch for determining cost per copy for color costs since in copying, costs are proportional to the amount of data on media, and data is directly proportional to the number of dots on the media.

As per claims 5 and 6, applicant argues that Fernberg does not teach any kind of print cost accounting that includes determining the amount of pigment actually used on an individual sheet, and that Fernberg, therefore, does not teach determining the amount of pigment used on each of a plurality of individual sheets. However, applicant makes similar arguments to those of claim 1 and claims 5 and 6 are therefore still rejected for the same reasons as disclosed with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the •Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 3628

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A. R. B.
March 29, 2008

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628